

come Vice President, the newly inaugurated President John F. Kennedy agreed reluctantly with the Chiefs of Staff, other generals and CIA leaders in permitting the Bay of Pigs invasion they had planned and which proved a horrible and tragic fiasco.

President Kennedy took the blame in his capacity as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. He said in private, "How could I have been so far off base?" The late great President John F. Kennedy did not make that mistake again. In fact, he said of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "They advise you the way a man advises another man whether he should marry a girl. He doesn't have to live with her."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur gave President Harry S. Truman very poor advice. He said—and this was late in 1950—"If any Chinese were to enter Korea they would face certain disaster." MacArthur added he did not expect them to try anything that foolish. He permitted his armed forces to be divided in North Korea with a mountain range between two armies.

He said in November 1950 following his successful Inchon landing, "The boys will be home from Korea by Christmas." On the following bitter wintry day the Chinese divisions, many thousands in number, crossed the Yalu and thousands of our finest soldiers and Marines fighting valiantly in the best traditions of our country lost their lives trying to stem the onslaught of the invading horde.

President Truman accepted the blame, not General MacArthur. In his reminiscences the General blamed the CIA, charging that agency gave him faulty intelligence.

President Eisenhower in 1954 was urged by Admiral Radford, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to send in our paratroopers and war planes to the rescue of Dienbienphu to save French colonialism making a last ditch fight against the National Liberation Forces of the Viet Minh, now termed Vietcong. At that time Vice President Nixon was a warhawk as he is now. He later revealed the fact that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and President Eisenhower were planning to send in our Armed Forces to save the Indochinese French colonial empire for the French and would have done so had not the British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, reacted violently against the proposal and Prime Minister Winston Churchill expressed his strong dissent.

Under President Kennedy in 1961, our Joint Chiefs of Staff again gave warlike advice. General Lemnitzer, then chairman, made a trip to Laos and then advised President Kennedy to send our Armed Forces into that jungle area. President Kennedy, according to the history of the memorable 1,000 days of that superb but so tragically terminated administration by Arthur Schlesinger, said, "If it hadn't been for Cuba, we might be about to interfere in Laos." Our late great President had learned the hard way not to be swayed by his warlike generals. Under his leadership an agreement was negotiated establishing the neutrality of Laos. We signed as guarantors of that

neutrality. The less said about whether, by our recent actions, we are honoring our agreement the better.

Mr. President, let us consider statements made by some of our other military leaders. Gen. J. W. O'Daniel, in 1961, speaking of South Vietnam as free Vietnam said, "The Communists now realize that they can never conquer free Vietnam." In 1963 Gen. Paul D. Harkins, commanding general of our forces in South Vietnam, said, "I can safely say that the end of the war is in sight." Adm. Harry D. Felt, the commander of our entire Pacific forces, earlier in 1963 said, "I am confident the South Vietnamese are going to win the war. The Vietcong face inevitable defeat." That was in 1963, at a time when the Saigon government held much more land area than they do at the present time.

In 1965 General Westmoreland, commander in South Vietnam, said, "If we can get the Vietcong to stand up and fight, we will blast him." Gen. Ellis Williamson added a footnote, "We can go in and tear pure hell out of the Vietcong."

The facts are that historically, there is no such thing as North Vietnam and South Vietnam. The Geneva accords of 1954, which we agreed to, but which our representatives did not sign, stated:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

If and when there are negotiations for a cease-fire or armistice and I feel that most, if not all, Americans hope that there will be such negotiations, and the sooner the better—whether those negotiations are held in Geneva or in the military demarcation zone separating what is termed North and South Vietnam or an Asiatic city, of course delegates representing the Vietcong or National Liberation Front, so-called, must be seated along with delegates of the Hanoi government and delegates of the United States.

Mr. President, parenthetically, the head of the Vietcong forces of the National Liberation Front, so-called, was born and reared in South Vietnam. Prime Minister Ky is now probably working in Hawaii that the Vietcong should not be permitted to participate in any conference, and that his Saigon government—which would probably not last 1 week without our support—should alone represent the people of South Vietnam. Ironically enough, Prime Minister Ky, of South Vietnam, was born and reared in Hanoi, which is now in North Vietnam.

Furthermore, Secretary of Defense McNamara and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Earle Wheeler, admit as of February 1966 that the Vietcong, or the forces of the National Liberation Front, so-called, in South Vietnam, hold more land area under their control in South Vietnam than they did in 1963 and in 1964. In fact Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon government, stated that his forces control but 25 percent of the land area of South Vietnam.

### POOR ADVICE HAS BEEN GIVEN OUR PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it has been unfortunate for our country, but the facts cannot be denied that President Eisenhower throughout his two terms favored the services and advice of multimillionaires and considered the counsel and advice of industrial tycoons to exceed the purity and validity of Ivory soap whose advertising men employed by Procter & Gamble claim is 99.44 percent pure. Incidentally, Neil H. McElroy, chairman of the board of Procter & Gamble was one of those multimillionaire industrial magnates high in his counsel, and for a time was his Secretary of Defense. George Humphrey and Charlie Wilson were among the multimillionaire industrialists upon whom President Eisenhower leaned and to whom he manifested deference and devotion. They were both members of his Cabinet.

It will be remembered that the first Eisenhower Cabinet was sometimes referred to as "eight millionaires and a plumber," the latter being the late Martin P. Durkin, president of the Plumbers' Union and Eisenhower's first Secretary of Labor. Incidentally, he resigned after only a few months in office.

It appears that President Eisenhower gave really second rating to generals. Perhaps one reason was that he himself had been a general and dealt with hundreds of other generals. Also, the fact that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the most flamboyant of all of our generals, had made the snide remark that "Eisenhower was the best clerk he had ever had" may have caused that President to take a dim view of at least one general.

Now President Johnson appears to hold generals in the highest admiration, appoints them to high positions usually reserved for or held by civilians, including ambassadorships, and follows their advice implicitly despite the fact that the record has proven many of them wrong on many occasions. In 1961 just a few weeks after Lyndon B. Johnson had be-

Continued

Unfortunately, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor who had been our Ambassador to South Vietnam and who posed as an authority on our situation in southeast Asia testified at a hearing of the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees of the U.S. Senate in 1965 that the government of the then Prime Minister, Phan Huy Quat, of South Vietnam was on a solid basis and there was no indication that this Prime Minister would be overturned by a coup. Yet, within 2 days after giving this optimistic testimony the generals had overturned that Prime Minister and installed a military council composed of Nguyen Van Thieu, Air Marshal Ky, and Brig. Gen. Nguyen Huu Co. and his council 7 days later installed Marshal Ky as Prime Minister. General Taylor was not even en route back to Vietnam before a few hours and events proved him 100 percent wrong. He was so wrong. Yet President Johnson appears to be impressed by his counsel.

It would seem that our situation in Vietnam would be better and we would have the friendship and support of other governments in Asia and elsewhere, instead of their opposition, if our President would tell the generals to stick to the job of being generals and the CIA to stick to the job of collecting intelligence, and depend more upon his own good judgment and unparalleled experience for the decisions that are his to make by reason of our constitutional system, which provides that civilian authority must always be supreme over the military.

The men who wrote the Constitution of our country were wise men. They provided in the Constitution which we revere that civilian authority must be supreme over the military. I am happy that on an historic occasion, that great President, Harry S. Truman, upheld that principle of our fundamental law when he removed General MacArthur from his post.

This is a civil war going on in Vietnam. Before I visited southeast Asia, it had been my belief that all of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were Communists and infiltrators from the North. But I had not been in Vietnam for more than 4 days—and during that period of time, I was in every area of Vietnam—when almost immediately I observed very definitely that we were involved in a miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam. I learned from General Westmoreland that the bulk of the Vietcong fighting in South Vietnam were born and reared in South Vietnam. I learned from General Stillwell and other generals that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting the Americans and the South Vietnamese in the Mekong Delta south and west of Saigon were born and reared in that Mekong Delta area. This is a civil war in which we are involved. The fighting has been going on there since 1945. Very definitely, Vietnam is of no strategic importance to the defense of the United States.

Approximately 230,000 Americans are committed in this cruel fighting in the jungles and rice paddies. That force

will no doubt be expanded and escalated. In addition, we have some 50,000 men of our 7th Fleet off the coast, and we have 20,000 troops from South Korea. But except for the Korean forces—all of whom are maintained, armed, fed, clothed, and paid by American taxpayers—and about 850 Australians and 200 New Zealanders, not one ally of ours has come to our aid in Vietnam—not Japan, despite the \$4 billion we have paid to build up Japan since we destroyed that country in World War II. As a matter of fact, while I was in Tokyo they were rioting against Americans. Even Chiang Kai-shek with his Taiwan regime which is a dependency of ours and has received some \$4 billion of American taxpayers' money, offered only a token force to help us.

We Americans should have a sense of history. We should remember that the history of China and of southeast Asia shows that China over thousands of years has never held sway over the area known as Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. Statues and monuments erected throughout this area and also Korea—as I observed during some 5 days that I was in Korea—commemorate battles and rulers centuries back who hurled back the hordes of Chinese invaders with great slaughter.

That is true in Vietnam. It is certainly true in Thailand. Successive Chinese emperors sought in vain to establish by force, sway and authority over this area in southeast Asia. History proves they never succeeded. On occasions when their forces invaded they held certain limited areas or sectors only for very limited periods of time, and then they were driven back north. The people of southeast Asia have over thousands of years—over the ages—shown on obstinate insistence on shaping their own destiny.

They have proven themselves in the past to be great warriors. The Chinese never, never overcame this and they would fail now. The French alone—with rifles and artillery against bows and arrows and knives—subjugated Vietnam; and then the Japanese took over for a short time only in World War II. The Vietnamese are fierce, obstinate, determined fighters who have been struggling for liberty for 21 years. They will never give up.

We lose face by messing into this miserable civil war in the steaming jungles and rice paddies of southeast Asia. We would save face by withdrawing to bases on the Vietnam coast for some short period of time, under the guns of our 7th Fleet and cover of our airpower—which is magnificent, as are our ground forces and our Navy. Our airpower, of course, is more powerful than the air and naval forces of all other nations in the world combined.

We would do well to withdraw to those bases on the seacoast for the time being, while the matter is before the Security Council of the United Nations. If that effort proves fruitless, then every effort should be made to secure a renewal of the Geneva Conference of 1954 with armistice terms that might be agreed on

carried out either by some international commission or under the auspices of the United Nations.

Finally, I emphasize that if the President would follow his own judgment and not listen to the generals who are seeking to advise on the foreign policy of our country, we would save the lives of thousands, and possibly millions of American boys.